

REMARKS

The Examiner is thanked for the thorough examination of the present application. The Office Action, however, rejected claims 1-4 and 6-32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Bell Labs technical Journal, Volume 8, Issue 1, Pages 27-42 in view of Mayer (USP 2005/0015499).

Response To Rejections

Claims 1 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as allegedly being anticipated by Bell Lab. journal in view of Mayer. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection on the grounds that the cited references do not disclose, teach, or suggest all of the claimed elements and limitation. Claim 1 discloses:

1. A triggering method for IP multimedia service control, comprising the steps of:
recording a Session Initial Protocol (SIP) request message received by a Serving Call Session Control Function (S-CSCF);
examining a corresponding **SIP response message** received by the S-CSCF according to a set of response Filter Criteria (rFC), comprising specific responses triggering individual application services available from a service provider; and
re-issuing the SIP request message to an application server designated by the rFC if the corresponding **SIP response message** matches Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of one of the rFC.

(*Emphasis added*). Claim 1 patently defines over the cited art for at least the reason that the cited art fails to disclose the features emphasized above.

Claim 1 defines a filtering mechanism by examining the corresponding **SIP response message** according to the response Filter Criteria, and re-issuing a SIP request message according to the corresponding **SIP response message** and Service Point Triggers (SPTs) of the rFC. The Bell Lab journal article teaches a filtering method

for SIP request messages such as REGISTER, INVITE, SUBSCRIBE, or BYE, but not in responses to request (Page 32, Column 1, lines 39-41). Likewise, Mayer only relevantly discloses a filtering method comprising a terminal transmitting a Subscribe request message to a home service proxy (i.e., S-CSCF) through a SIP outbound proxy (FIG. 2, step 21), the home service proxy (i.e., S-CSCF) obtaining a configuration event filter to direct the Subscribe request message for a configuration event package to a corresponding Service Configuration Server (SCS) accordingly (FIG. 2, step 23). Therefore, Mayer doesn't disclose, teach, or suggest the home service proxy to compare SIP response message with the configuration event filter.

Both the bell Lab journal article and Mayer teach the filtering methods filtering a Subscribe request message according to a set of filter criteria, and neither the Bell Lab journal article nor Mayer discloses, suggests, or implies the claim limitation of "examining a corresponding SIP response message received by the S-CSCF according to a set of rFC" as defined in claim 1. For at least these reasons, claim 1 patently defines over the cited art.

Regarding independent claim 17, claim 17 embodies features similar to the defining features of claim 1. Therefore, claim 17 defines over the cited art for the same reasons as claim 1.

Insofar as claims 2-16 are dependent on claim 1, and claims 18-32 are dependent on claim 17, these claims define over the cited art for the same reasons.

Should the Examiner believe that a teleconference would be helpful to expedite the examination of this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

No fee is believed to be due in connection with this amendment and response. If, however, any fee is deemed to be payable, you are hereby authorized to charge any such fee to Deposit Account No. 20-0778.

Respectfully submitted,

/Daniel R. McClure/

By:

Daniel R. McClure, Reg. No. 38,962

Thomas, Kayden, Horstemeyer & Risley, LLP
600 Galleria Pkwy, SE
Suite 1500
Atlanta, GA 30339
770-933-9500